Appeal No. 05-0091

05-0091 Audit Signed 08/15/2005

### BEFORE THE UTAH STATE TAX COMMISSION

PETITIONER 1 & PETITIONER 2, **ORDER** Petitioners, 05-0091 Appeal No. ##### Account No. v. **AUDITING DIVISION OF** Tax Type: Income THE UTAH STATE TAX Tax Years: 1997, 1998, 1999, 2001 COMMISSION. Judge: Phan Respondent.

## **Presiding:**

Jane Phan, Administrative Law Judge

# **Appearances:**

For Petitioner: PETITIONER 2

For Respondent: RESPONDENT REPRESENTATIVE 1, Assistant Attorney General

RESPONDENT REPRESENTATIVE 2, Manager, Income Tax Auditing

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This matter came before the Utah State Tax Commission for an Initial Hearing pursuant to the provisions of Utah Code Ann. >59-1-502.5, on June 30, 2005.

Petitioners are appealing the assessment of Utah individual income tax, penalties and interest for tax years 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2001. The audits were prepared as nonfiling audits and Statutory Notices of Estimated Income Tax were issued on January 19, 2005. The total amount of the tax, penalties and interest accrued up to the date the audits were issued was \$\$\$\$\$. The penalties assessed with the audit were a 10% late payment and a 10% late filing penalty for each of the years in question.

#### APPLICABLE LAW

A tax is imposed on the state taxable income of every resident individual for each taxable year.

(Utah Code Ann. 359-10-104).

Resident individual is defined in Utah Code Ann. >59-10-103(1)(k) (2001) as follows:

- (k) "Resident individual" means:
- (i) an individual who is domiciled in this state for any period of time during the taxable year, but only for the duration of such period; or
- (ii) an individual who is not domiciled in this state but maintains a permanent place of abode in this state and spends in the aggregate 183 or more days of the taxable year in this state. For purposes of this Subsection (1)(k)(ii), a fraction of a calendar day shall be counted as a whole day.

For purposes of determining whether an individual is domiciled in this state the Commission has defined "domicile" in Utah Administrative Rule R865-9I-2(D) (2001) as follows:

ADomicile≅ means the place where an individual has a true, fixed, permanent home and principal establishment, and to which place he has (whenever he is absent) the intention of returning. It is the place in which a person has voluntarily fixed the habitation of himself or herself and family, not for a mere special or temporary purpose, but with the present intention of making a permanent home. After domicile has been established, two things are necessary to create a new domicile: first, an abandonment of the old domicile; and second, the intention and establishment of a new domicile. The mere intention to abandon a domicile once established is not of itself sufficient to create a new domicile; for before a person can be said to have changed his or her domicile, a new domicile must be shown.

The Utah Legislature has specifically provided that the taxpayer bears the burden of proof in proceedings before the Tax Commission. Utah Code Ann. 359-10-543 provides the following:

In any proceeding before the commission under this chapter, the burden of proof shall be upon the petitioner . . .

The Tax Commission is granted the authority to waive, reduce, or compromise penalties and interest upon showing of reasonable cause. (Utah Code Ann. 359-1-401(10).)

#### DISCUSSION

Respondent based its audit on the assertion that Petitioners were domiciled in Utah during the years at issue. Petitioners had not filed resident Utah Individual Income Tax Returns and maintain that they had moved to STATE and were no longer residents or domiciled in Utah during the tax years.

The issue in this appeal is whether Petitioner was a "resident individual" in the State of Utah for the purposes of Utah Code Ann.  $\ni$ 59-10-103(1)(k). A "resident individual" is one who spends in the aggregate more than 183 days per year in Utah, or, in the alternative, one who is "domiciled" in the State of Utah. Petitioners were clearly residents and domiciled in the State of Utah prior to 1997. In order to show that they were no longer domiciled in Utah during the period in question Petitioners must show: 1) that they abandoned their Utah domicile; and 2) that they intended to and did in fact establish a new domicile in STATE.

The facts as presented by the parties indicate that the PETITIONERS purchased a residence in STATE late in 1997 and that they did move there for a period of time at least in 1998 and 1999. However, the facts are clear that at least PETITIONER 2 and the children did not abandon their Utah domicile.

They did purchase a house in STATE, children attended school in STATE for possibly a twoyear period, they transferred their church records to STATE. PETITIONER 1 obtained a STATE driver's license, STATE resident hunting licenses, concealed weapons permit as well as worked full time in STATE. Dental care and at least one doctor visit for the children occurred in STATE during 1998.

However, the PETITIONERS maintained a residence of significant value in Utah. They did not try to sell or lease the residence. They left the utilities on and three telephone lines going into the

residence. PETITIONER 2 operated a trucking business and the business address remained the address of the Utah residence. Although some mail was sent to the STATE address during the audit period, some mail was also sent to Utah at the post office box that Petitioners maintained throughout the audit period. PETITIONER 2 retained her Utah driver's license and several of the children had Utah driver's licenses during the period at issue. PETITIONER 2 was registered to vote in Utah and voted in Utah for elections in 1997, 1999, 2000, and 2001. She was elected to the local Utah school board in 2000. Vehicles were registered in Utah. During the hearing she indicated that she had returned to Utah in 2000 with the children. In addition several of the minor children were receiving W-2's from employment in Utah during 1999, 2000 and 2001. One child, (X) had worked in Utah at a drug store during 1999 and 2000. He had filed a Utah Resident Return for 1999 and would have been 16 at that time. From the facts it appears that Petitioners may have had two residences, one in Utah and one in STATE, but it is clear that PETITIONER 2 and her children did not abandon the Utah domicile.

From the information that was presented PETITIONER 1 had the most ties to the state of STATE. The Tax Commission has found on occasion that a husband and wife may have a separate state domicile for income tax purposes where it is clear that one spouse has severed ties to the state of Utah, has established a domicile in the other state and intends to remain indefinitely in the other state. When this happens the income from each spouse is taxed separately to the state of domicile of the spouse. However, there is a heavy burden on the taxpayer to overcome the presumption that his or her domicile is with his or her family. PETITIONER 1 did not attend the hearing and PETITIONER 2 could not answer some of the relevant questions at the hearing regarding PETITIONER 1. The PETITIONERS have the burden of proof in this matter and there was simply insufficient evidence to determine if PETITIONER 1 had abandoned his Utah domicile.

Appeal No. 05-0091

The penalties assessed with the audit were 10% failure to file penalties and 10% failure to pay

penalties. The Tax Commission may waive penalties on a showing of reasonable cause. Since the family did

not move to STATE until after the residence was purchased and the purchase appears to have occurred in

November 1997, the Commission does not find cause for waiver of the penalties for that year. In addition

PETITIONER 2 and the children had returned to Utah in 2000 and possible as early as 1999. The Commission

does not find sufficient basis for waiver of the penalties.

**DECISION AND ORDER** 

Based upon the information presented at the hearing, and the records of the Tax Commission, the

Commission sustains the audit assessment of additional tax, penalties and interest for the tax years 1997, 1998,

1999 and 2001. It is so ordered.

This decision does not limit a party's right to a Formal Hearing. However, this Decision and Order will

become the Final Decision and Order of the Commission unless any party to this case files a written request

within thirty (30) days of the date of this decision to proceed to a Formal Hearing. Such a request shall be

mailed to the address listed below and must include the Petitioner's name, address, and appeal number:

Utah State Tax Commission Appeals Division 210 North 1950 West Salt Lake City, Utah 84134

| Failure to request a | Formal Hearing will preclu- | de any further appeal rights in this matter. |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| DATED this           | day of                      | , 2005.                                      |
|                      |                             |  |
| Jane Phan            |                             |  |
| Administrative Lav   | v Judge                     |  |

-5-

| Appeal No. 05-0091        |                         |   |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|---|
|                           |                         |   |
|                           |                         |   |
|                           |                         |   |
|                           |                         |   |
|                           |                         |   |
|                           |                         |   |
|                           |                         |   |
|                           |                         |   |
| BY ORDER OF THE UTAH STAT | E TAX COMMISSIO         | DN.   |
| The Commission ha         | s reviewed this case an | nd the undersigned concur in this decision. |
| DATED this                | day of                  | , 2005.                                     |
|                           |                         |   |
| Pam Hendrickson           |                         | R. Bruce Johnson                            |
| Commission Chair          |                         | Commissioner                                |
|                           |                         |   |
|                           |                         |   |
| Palmer DePaulis           |                         | Marc B. Johnson                             |

**NOTICE:** If a Formal Hearing is not requested, failure to pay the balance due as determined by this order within thirty days of the date hereon, may result in a late payment penalty.

Commissioner

JKP/05-0091.int.doc

Commissioner